nonetheless praiseworthy. It is always a praiseworthy endeavor when one seeks to support revealed truth by means of reason, and I think the opinion of Pomponazzi, who believed that it was an insult to faith to try and prove the immortality of soul through reason, is absurd.[2] Having made this declaration, no reasonable reader shall grow indignant if I should present my opinions frankly in the following since they will in no way be contrary to what has been asserted in this paragraph.

§5

Having just set out what in this treatise is in no way subject to consideration, I now want to give some indication of its proper subject matter. I will endeavor to demonstrate three things. The first consists in showing that we humans cannot prove the immortality of the soul with any mathematical certainty on the basis of reason; or, that the same cannot be demonstrated when one takes these terms in their strictest signification. I am not at all contesting immortality itself and its truth, but rather I am only assailing the claim of its certainty through reason. [. . .] My opinion on the immortality of the soul is, thus, far removed from that of the eminent Bayle. Bayle belongs among those *duplicists*[3] who believe that reason and Scripture contradict one another, and that one can raise irresolvable doubts by means of reason concerning the soul's immortality. He knows of no other remedy for this than that one must leave the battlefield in these rational disputes and take shelter under the canons of faith. By contrast, when it comes to the immortality of the soul, I take it that reason and Scripture are never so much as contrary to one another. I claim only that one cannot irrefutably demonstrate the soul's immortality through reason. Left to its own devices, reason cannot, in my estimation, incite any doubt concerning the immortality of the soul and its truth but can, at least as far as I can see given the current state of my knowledge, very well raise irrefutable doubts regarding the perfect certainty of this truth that is so worthy of being accepted.

§6

Secondly, in this treatise I will endeavor to demonstrate that we do not yet have an irrefutable proof through reason of the soul's immortality, or that at this point no one has yet demonstrated this truth. To set this claim in the appropriate light, it will be necessary to evaluate the familiar proofs of the immortality of the soul. I will therefore appraise the best proofs of this truth that have been crafted by philosophers and which are widely taken for demonstrations, and show their inadequacy. [. . .]

[2] Pietro Pomponazzi (1462–1525) was an Italian philosopher working within the broadly Aristotelian tradition, though his treatise *De immortalitate animae* (1516) challenged the claim that Aristotle's views on the soul were consistent with maintaining its immortality, and concluded that the soul's immortality is an article of faith and not demonstrable. For a discussion of Pomponazzi's views on the topic that Meier likely has in mind, see notes "F," "G," and "H," to Bayle's article "Pomponatius" (in *Dictionary Historical and Critical*, vol. 4, pp. 717–20).

[3] The duplicists were followers of the controversial Lutheran theologian Daniel Hoffmann (1538–1611) who maintained the distinction and even opposition between revealed and rational truths; see Hoffmann's *Pro duplici veritate Lutheri* (Magdeburg, 1600) and note "C" to Bayle's entry "Hoffmann" (in *Dictionary Historical and Critical*, vol. 3, p. 479).